DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 315 002 HE 023 168

AUTHOR Buzza, Bonnie Wilson; Holmes, Kelli S.
TITLE A Descriptive Study of Small College Speech Programs: 1987, Formulative Study and Base Data.
INSTITUTION Wooster Coll., Ohio.
SPONS AGENCY Pew Memorial Trust, Philadelphia, Pa.
PUB DATE 89
NOTE 61p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Statistical Data (110)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; Curriculum Development; Higher Education; Longitudinal Studies; Program Development; *Small Colleges; *Speech Communication; *Speech Curriculum; Speech Therapy

ABSTRACT

A 1987 study surveyed the national membership (N=350) of the Speech Communication Association's Committee on Small College Speech Programs as the first step in a longitudinal project to describe and monitor speech communication programs on small campuses as well as small programs on larger campuses. Data helped to: (1) determine trends in program development in speech communication in smaller institutions; (2) assist faculty and administrators in program development; and (3) assist the Committee with member services. A three-part survey gathered data on: member name, address, and institutional affiliation; department and program; and department staffing. Findings based on a 45% response rate confirmed the original picture of considerable diversity among small colleges, yet patterns emerged. Most of the institutions were private four-year colleges of 500 to 2,000 students which considered themselves small colleges. The smaller ones were more likely than the larger ones to include a speech course as a requirement for graduation. Four full-time faculty members was the typical departmental staff size. Most faculty were full-time and tenured or tenure track. About two-thirds were male, and the gender factor seemed consistent with national data suggesting a disproportionately smaller number of females in the upper faculty ranks. Findings can be helpful in program planning and for the Committee as it seeks to assist its membership in program and professional development. An appendix details institutional data across all categories; institutional data by enrollment size; and faculty data. Contains 11 references. (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED315002

A Descriptive Study of Small College Speech Programs: 1987, Formulative Study and Base Data

by
Bonnie Wilson Buzza
and
Kelli S. Holmes

Department of Communication
The College of Wooster
Wooster, Ohio 44691

Student assistance in data analysis for this project was provided by a grant from the Pew Memorial Trust to The College of Wooster to support a program of collaborative research between faculty and students.

HE 023 168

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Bonnie Wilson Buzza

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A Descriptive Study of Small College Speech Programs:
1987, Formulative Study and Base Data

Because of the unavailability of normative data on speech programs at small colleges, these departments and communication programs often must do curriculum and staff planning without a strong sense of what is taking place in program development in the discipline at similar institutions. Good descriptive data on programs, curriculum, and faculty could help provide a college with a reference point for its own individual department and course development and for its staffing considerations. Furthermore, noting national trends on an ongoing basis could help keep small programs up to date in the discipline.

Since the inception of the SCA Committee on Small College Speech Programs in 1978, a question which has continued to engage Committee members is that of similarities and differences between programs. It had originally been assumed that small college speech programs were generally alike, and led to heavy and diverse faculty teaching loads, a feeling of professional isolation among small college faculty members, and considerable individual responsibility for program maintenance and development. While those latter considerations continue to be voiced at meetings of the Committee, differences in individual programs have become apparent.

Smitter and MacDoniels (1983) noted wide-ranging diversity in curricular offerings among the 61 institutions they sampled, and (1985) cited diversity in mission statements. Their findings on curriculum and program diversity generated a series of summer conferences to explore "The Essential Undergraduate Curriculum in Speech Communication at the Small College" (Smitter and Buzza, 1987). Buzza (1983, 1984) noted departmental differences among Associated Colleges of the Midwest and Great Lakes Colleges Association institutions. Manning (1982) sampled for comparison 4 institutions from the two consortia Buzza considered.

Developing a methodology for analysis, however, has been slow. In the research noted above both Buzza and Smitter and MacDoniels relied upon information obtained from studying college catalogues. Manning conducted telephone interviews, but of a limited sample size. Waite (1985) mailed a survey to 90 small colleges and universities in the Midwest and received 46 responses. His was the most standard methodology, but is still of a small population.

Earlier studies of small college speech programs were similarly limited in scope. Boase (1965) sampled 41 institutions. More recent national surveys conducted on a large scale by the Association for Communication Administration (Becker, et. al., 1983, 1984) either didn't consider small college programs or didn't break out small college programs for separate analysis.

Thus the Committee on Small College Speech Programs still has incomplete information on relevant programs throughout the nation. Lacking a good understanding of the programs themselves the Committee is limited in its understanding of their strengths, their problems, and ways to assist them. Additionally, faculty and administrators in small programs continue to lack good normative data to assist in their program and curriculum development.

This current research is the first step in a longitudinal project to describe and monitor speech communication programs on small campuses, as well as small programs on larger campuses. This pilot project was carried out during 1987 and surveyed the full national

membership of the Speech Communication Association's Committee on Small College Speech Programs, some 350 persons. Data from the pilot project has been used to provide an information base for the longitudinal study on academic programs and faculty composition, for purposes of analysis and comparison 1) to help determine trends in program development in speech communication in smaller institutions, 2) to assist faculty members and administrators in program development, and 3) to assist the Committee on Small College Speech Programs with member services.

Limitations of the Study

This pilot study was conducted to determine if the longitudinal study would be useful and practical, as well as to assist in the development of the survey instrument and the format for data analysis. Several limitations should be noted at the outset.

There is a difference between doing formulative and reactive research. In formulative research an inductive model is used. Broad information is sought and observations are made which can lead to generalizations for further research and testing. Reactive research uses a deductive model to test generalizations in the form of hypotheses. This research is of the formulative type. A broad series of questions were asked and responses tabulated to guide in the formulation of directions and questions for further research.

A number of the survey questions were open-ended to provide general information on programs; types of responses were then coded to make tabulations possible. Some of the open-ended questions made tabulation of results difficult, and answers cannot be reported in summary form. Because of the small sample size in some response categories, certain conclusions in the present study can only be drawn with caution. On the basis of this formulative project, however, both the survey form and the data analysis have been refined for the longitudinal study which should provide more extensive data in a more usable format.

Budgetary considerations constrained the survey itself, which was sent along with the newsletter of the Small College Committee to its membership to save postage costs. No return envelopes were provided. The questionnaire was included with three newsletter mailings to help encourage responses. Better follow-up can be provided in the longitudinal study.

Data analysis was slow until the Pew grant at the College of Wooster provided research assistance. The original data were obtained during 1987, but final data analysis was not completed until 1989. Individual programs no doubt have changed in that time period. However, the first update of the original data is currently in process. The new survey was mailed in September of 1989 and analysis should be completed over the summer of 1990. Comparisons of results will give an indication of program change over the three-year period.

Method of the Study

Context. During 1986 refinement began on the mailing list of members of the Committee on Small College Speech Programs of the Speech Communication Association, along with the development of a directory of research and teaching interests of the members. In 1987 the research survey accompanied issues of the organization's newsletter and members were encouraged to return the information requested to provide demographic data on programs and personnel.

Survey Form. The two page response form contained three sections. Part A included member name, address, and institutional affiliation along with areas of primary research and teaching interest. Part B included information on the recipient's department and program. Part C

included information on staffing in the department. Members completing the response forms were encouraged to provide information in all three sections, but a few completed only the first section. Most completed part B and many completed part C, but in this latter part there were often incomplete responses in addition to a lower response rate. When information was requested on several faculty members, for example, not all information was provided on all members of the department.

Rate of Return. Questionnaires were mailed to some 350 members over a period of about eighteen months. They were included as part of the regular newsletter mailings, on a separate sheet of a contrasting color. Members thus received the questionnaire more than once, although those adding themselves to the mailing list over that time period, approximately thirty people, may have received only one mailing. Several members also filled out the questionnaire more than once, and duplicates were removed before tabulation of the data. Occasionally several members of one department were on the mailing list and thus all received mailings. The individual responses were retained for part A, the mailing list and directory. Institutional duplicates were removed prior to data tabulation from the survey. The most current information was used when members responded more than once; the report of the department chair was used for institutional data when several members of a department replied.

Of the approximately 350 questionnaires mailed, 157 were returned for a response rate of 45%. There were a total of 134 usable surveys, but not necessarily 134 responses to each question since some respondents did not reply to all questions.

Analysis of Data. Originally an informal analysis and reporting of data had been intended; however, with increased availability of computers and software for data analysis it was decided to do a more complete analysis of the initial data, despite constraints on the analysis imposed by the data's occasional incompleteness (especially concerning the profiles of faculty members) and the need to convert some responses to numerical and at times closed-ended forms.

Part A, "Mailing List and Directory Information," was placed into a database using Filemaker II where it could be updated, converted to mailing labels for future mailings, and sorted to provide a directory and lists of names and addresses of members of the Committee on Small College Speech Programs who have particular research interests and areas of teaching expertise.

Part B, "Information on Departments," was placed into a similar database for storage, and then converted for use with Statview 512+. Frequency distributions were obtained for all responses, but five factors were particularly considered in the initial analysis:

1) institution size and type
2) perception of the institution as a small college
3) presence or absence of a college-wide speech requirement
4) number of full and part time faculty in the department
5) presence or absence of an extra-curricular speech activity program.

Questions were also asked concerning courses offered and areas of the discipline emphasized by individual departments but responses were so varied that tabulation was impossible. The revised survey uses a closed question format for these responses.

Part C, "Information on Faculty Members," was also placed into the database and the statistical package. In this initial analysis several factors were noted:

1) Faculty size: numbers of full-time and part time faculty members
2) Faculty status: whether positions were tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenured
3) Academic ranks of faculty members

4) Seniority: years faculty members had been at the institution
5) Highest degree held by the faculty member
6) Year highest degree was received
7) Undergraduate background: if faculty member had attended a small college
8) Race of faculty members*
9) Gender of faculty members*

*Participation in the survey or response to any particular question was optional for the respondent.

Results and Discussion

Institutional Data

The first factor considered institution size and type. Many of the institutions reporting fit the stereotype of "small, private, liberal arts colleges." Of the 128 institutions reporting, **96% are 4-year institutions. 88.3% are private rather than public**. Surprisingly, however, 51% grant graduate degrees in some area, although only **3% offer some sort of graduate degree in speech**. These degrees are offered at institutions of 500 to 1000 students, 1500 to 2000 students, and over 5000 students.

72% of the institutions have enrollments below 2000 students, with three categories having almost equal proportions, as follows:

5.5% -- under 500 students
22.7% -- 500 to 1000 students
22.7% -- 1000 to 1500 students
21.1% -- 1500 to 2000 students
17.2% -- 2000 to 3000 students
7.0% -- 3000 to 5000 students
Others replying have over 5000.

The second factor considered the institution's self-perception as a small college. **92.2% of the institutions responding consider themselves small colleges; 4.7% consider themselves small programs in larger institutions; 3.1% consider themselves to be at large institutions but supporters of small colleges**. Not only were frequency distributions obtained for all institutions reporting, but separate analyses and comparisons were performed by institutional size.

The third factor considered the presence or absence of a speech requirement. **A college-wide speech requirement is more common at smaller institutions.** For example, 71% of the colleges with under 500 students have a speech requirement; 67% of the colleges of 500-1000 students have speech requirements; and 58% of the colleges of 1000-1500 students have such requirements. In contrast, 49% of the colleges of 1500-2000 students have those requirements; 42% of those 2000-3000 have them, 44% of those 3000 to 5000, and 50% of those over 5000 have them. The prevalence of such a requirement at the smaller institutions may be due to an historical or religious commitment on the part of the institution to develop skills of critical thinking and citizenship among its students, to which it continues to commit a proportion of its faculty resources and student academic preparation via a required speech course.

The fourth factor dealt with faculty size within the department. **A full-time faculty size of 4 seems to be common, despite institutional size.** 29% of the colleges of under 500 students have 2 faculty members, but another 29% have 4. Similarly, most colleges of 500 to 1000 students have 2 (31%) or 4 (31%) full time faculty members. 42% of the colleges of

1000 to 1500 students have 4 full time faculty members while 14% have each of 2, 5, and 6 faculty members. 35% of the colleges of 1500 to 2000 students have 4 full time faculty members, and 20% have each of 3, 5, and 6 full time faculty members. 28% of the institutions of 2000 to 3000 students have 4 full-time faculty members, with 21% having 3 and another 21% having 5.; 2, 6 and more than 6 full time faculty members were also reported. Institutions of 3000 to 5000 students reported faculty sizes of 5 and 6, and **the one institution of over 5000 reporting faculty size had two full-time and one part-time faculty member, providing an example of a small program being located at a larger institution.**

Use of part-time faculty members is not uncommon. All of the institutions of under 500 students have one or more part-time faculty members, with 2 being the most common number but ranging as high as 5 on one campus. At institutions of 500 to 1000 students, all but two use part-time faculty, with 33.3% having two and 26% having one. As many as six part-time faculty are used on these campuses. At institutions of 1000 to 1500 up to 4 part-time faculty members are used on 95% of the campuses. All but one institution of 2000 to 3000 students reports using one or more part-time faculty member, and two-thirds of the institutions 3000 to 5000 students use one or more part-time faculty member.

The fifth considered the extra-curricular program. **The presence of an extra-curricular speech program (debate, individual events, readers theatre, or theatre) was not common.** 15% of all institutions reported having an NDT debate program and 34% reported having a CEDA debate program, but the researchers believe the phrasing of the question on the survey may have been unclear, and thus caution should be exercised in interpreting this data. 40% of the institutions reporting have some kind of individual events program, 21% have a readers theatre, and 48% a drama program.

The data were sufficiently unreliable to make the researchers report only general trends regarding specific programs, not percentages. Debate (NDT or CEDA) was reported on the very small campuses (under 1000), the mid-size campuses, and the larger campuses, with the very smallest campuses frequently reporting some kind of debate program. This is consistent with the finding of a required speech course on those campuses, possibly indicating an institutional commitment to speech and speech activities. Fewer mid-size campuses reported having a debate program, but it became more common at larger institutions. Individual events were more prevalent than debate on the mid-range campuses, if there was a speech activity program reported. There was little consistency in the presence or absence of a drama program, but the departmental structure which in some cases provided for a combined department probably affected this data.

Faculty Data

Information on faculty was based on a sample of 386 faculty members. Data in most cases is based on a sample size ranging from 350 to 360 since respondents did not answer all questions.

Faculty composition (size and status). **81.3% are full time faculty members,** 15.3% are part time and 3.4% are temporary appointments. **61.4% are tenured,** and 38.6% are tenure track among those responding to this question. About 70 did not check either alternative and were probably in non-tenure track, part time, or temporary positions. The revised survey will provide this data.

Academic rank. Faculty ranks ranged as follows:

Lecturer -	3.4%
Instructor -	16.6%
Assistant -	**33.8%**
Associate -	**23.9%**
Professor -	**22.3%**

Seniority. **45% of those responding had been at the institution fewer than 5 years and 27% had been there sixteen years or more.** 18% and 9% had been there six to ten years and eleven to fifteen years, respectively.

Highest degree and year received. **48% have Ph.D.'s.**, 6% have M.F.A.'s, 32% have M.A.'s , and 7% were ABD. The other faculty had M. S. or other degrees. **26% received their highest degree between 1981 and 1985 and 10% received it after 1986; however, 26% received their highest degree before 1970.** About 20% received their degrees between 1976 and 1980, and 18% between 1971 and 1975.

These data suggest many new and junior faculty members, and also a number of senior faculty members. **There are fewer mid-career faculty members, as is the case in the professorate in general.** The fact that over one-fourth of the faculty members received their terminal degree prior to 1970 suggests an **important role for faculty development programs.** The great percentage of senior faculty members and faculty who have been at their institutions for over sixteen years suggests a **need in the future to provide new graduates of Ph. D. programs with the opportunity to consider teaching on the small college campus as a reasonable alternative to teaching at a major research institution.** Without the availability of new faculty, smaller institutions may be especially affected by the anticipated shortage of college faculty nationally. The continuation of a smaller program is always of concern when a faculty member retires or leaves, because the smaller overall faculty size for the program means that there is greater personal involvement of each faculty member in the program. Departments of one or two faculty members would be especially hard-hit, and continuation of the whole program would be problematic without replacement staffing. (Buzza, 1985)

Type of undergraduate institution. About half of those responding indicated that they had attended a small college as an undergraduate.

Race of faculty members. **One finding to note is that 98.78% of the faculty at the reporting institutions are White. In fact, of 328 respondents to this question, only three reported "Black" as their race and one reported "Hispanic."** There were so few non-White faculty members that relevant analysis of this variable could not be made.

Gender of faculty members. **The gender factor provided data which is consistent with that reported nationally, i.e. that more women than men are clustered in the lower ranks or in part time positions.** Some of the data is summarized below.

226 men and 125 women made up the pool, giving percentages of 64% and 36% of the total respondents. 85% of the males are full time, 75% of the females are full time (216 males, 111 females).

Of the males, 30.1% are professors, 22.2% are associates, 32.9% are assistants, 12.5% are instructors, and 2.3% are lecturers.

Of the females, 9.9% are professors, 25.2% are associates, 33.3% are assistants, 26.1% are instructors, and 5.4% are lecturers.

It is sometimes argued that the difference in rank can be accounted for by seniority. This is not fully supported by the present data. Of the males, 30.5% had been at the institution for sixteen years or more; of the females, 22.5% had been there that long. They can be compared as follows:

males, 16+ years - 30.5%	females, 16+ years - 22.5%
11-15 years - 9.0%	11-15 years - 9.2%
6-10 years - 17.6%	6-10 years - 21.7%
0 - 5 years - 42.9%	0- 5 years - 46.7%

Highest degrees might account for some of the difference, since 53% of the male faculty members and only 36% of the females have Ph. D.'s. 45% of the female faculty members and only 26% of the males have M.A.'s.

Cross tabulations with seniority were also examined. For male faculty members who had been at their institutions sixteen years or more, 69% were full professors, 27% were associates, and 3% were assistants. For females who had been at their institutions sixteen years or more, only 35% were full professors, 35% were associates, and 23% were instructors.

When highest degree was added to the interaction, a further picture emerged. For male faculty members with Ph.D.'s who had been there sixteen years or more, 93% were full professors, 7% were associates. For female faculty members with Ph. D.'s who had been at their institutions sixteen years or more, 70% were professors and 30% were associates.

When the degree was received might account for some of the difference. Most males received their highest degrees prior to 1970 (29%); 24% received theirs 1981-85 and 10% received theirs after 1986. Most females received their highest degrees 1981-85 (29%) and 10% also received theirs after 1986. However, 24% of the female faculty received their degrees prior to 1970.

The data were then analyzed to determine which of those early degrees were Ph.D.'s and how many of those female faculty with the earlier degrees were in the senior rank. Here, however, the numbers became so small that the percentages, although provided, need to be used cautiously. Only 7 women Ph.D.'s have been at their institutions sixteen or more years. Of that group, 43% (or 3 women) received their degrees prior to 1970, 29% (or 2 women) between 1976 and 1980, and another 29% (2 women) received theirs between 1981 and 1985. There are 36 men who have Ph. D.'s and have been at their institutions over sixteen years. **With a one-third female professorate reporting, the difference in these figures (7 compared with 36) suggests a difference in career paths,** particularly when one observes that 58% (or 21) of the men received their Ph. D.'s prior to 1979, 31% (or 11) of the men received them between 1971 and 1975, and only 11% (or 4 men) received their Ph. D.'s between 1976 and 1985. How long the women have held their Ph. D. degrees might account in part for their disproportionate representation in the full professor rank; **however, having the terminal degree, whenever it was received, plus sixteen or more years of institutional service, would seem to fit expectations of many small colleges for movement into the upper rank.**

Clearly the presence of a terminal degree is a factor in the advancement of female faculty, but that degree and seniority apparently interact with the gender factor in terms of advancement to the senior rank. The data suggest a disproportionate number of male to female full professors based on the variables selected for consideration. In addition, differences in career paths of male and female faculty members is suggested.

Conclusions

The findings confirm the original picture of considerable diversity among small colleges, yet some patterns are emerging. Most of the institutions reporting are private 4-year colleges of 500 to 2000 students and consider themselves to be

small colleges. Among them, the smaller institutions are more likely than the larger ones to include a speech course as a requirement for graduation. Four full time faculty members is the typical staff size, with a range of two to six generally depending on institutional size. Of the institutions with extra-curricular speech activity programs, fewer than half of the institutions reporting, individual events were more common than debate programs.

Most faculty are full time and are tenured or tenure track. The faculty is generally either junior or senior, with fewer mid-career faculty members in terms of rank, when the highest degree was received, and the number of years at the institution. About half have Ph. D.'s and about half attended a small college as an undergraduate.

About two thirds of the faculty are male and the gender factor seems consistent with national data which also suggest a disproportionately smaller number of females in the upper rank. Seniority, highest degree, and year the degree was received do not seem to fully account for the differences. The faculty members from the institutions reporting were nearly 99% White. Institutions with Affirmative Action concerns might wish to address these issues.

The original purpose of the survey was to update the membership and mailing list of the Committee on Small College Speech Programs of the Speech Communication Association. Part A of the present research assisted in the completion of that task.

Part B of the questionnaire, on departments and programs, has provided useful specific information and is based on a sample considerably larger than those in the past. The information is stored for future comparisons, and the questionnaire has been refined to provide long-term monitoring of programs and departments. The first update of the research will take place during 1989-90.

Part C of the questionnaire, on faculty members, provided such incomplete information that it must be considered only preliminary data. However, it is the most comprehensive data currently available to provide a profile of small colleges and their faculty members in speech communication. This part of the questionnaire has been considerably revised for the 1989-90 research. Analysis of responses dealing with undergraduate and graduate backgrounds of small college faculty members will provide useful information from a more refined instrument. Chairs and administrators will then have some assistance in responding to future staffing needs of their programs. Such information must be developed on career patterns of faculty members teaching at small colleges to assist both departments seeking faculty committed to small college teaching and graduate programs seeking career options for their students.

Directions for Future Research

The present study was undertaken to determine if the gathering of longitudinal data on small college speech programs would be useful and practical. The findings of even this formulative data can provide useful information for institutions in their program planning and for the Committee on Small College Speech Programs as it seeks to assist its membership in program and professional development.

A variety of other cross tabulations of the data could be made for further analysis, among them consideration of various faculty descriptors by institutional size and comparisons of additional program categories by institutional size. However, sample sizes reduce considerably among some sizes of institutions reporting and the data is less reliable. With the development and mailing of the revised survey, it seems more useful to concentrate on the new and improved data being received.

On the basis of this formulative project, both the survey form and the data analysis have been refined for the longitudinal study which should provide more extensive data in a more usable format. Two program questions will be considered in the revised research which should prove especially useful to departments contemplating self-studies and curriculum development. They involve courses offered at various institutions and areas of program emphasis. Such information, particularly on courses, should also help the Committee on Small College Speech Programs to monitor the acceptance and evolution of the "Essential Undergraduate Curriculum in Speech Communication," the result of several summer conferences held at Hope College. Trends in curriculum development can be monitored in subsequent studies.

Because of diversity in response, three open-ended answers relating to faculty were not tabulated in the present analysis: if faculty members had received their undergraduate educations at small colleges, the names of the colleges; names of the institutions where faculty members had received their highest graduate degrees; and names of the institutions where they had previously taught. Such information on faculty educational and career patterns can be of interest for staff replacement as well as the staffing of future departments and programs. If particular institutions produce a significant number of small college teachers, the programs and attitudes at those institutions might be studied to determine why this is so. Model programs might serve as a help toward other institutions' providing teachers for small colleges. In the revised survey such information is obtained by use of closed questions.

Not all small colleges having speech communication programs are represented in the SCA Committee. Research should be expanded to include non-member as well as member institutions in the data pool. This further step in data gathering is planned after the results of the 1989 survey are tabulated.

The present study provides a major step in the demographic analysis of small college speech programs, both in sample size and in data analysis. In addition to providing preliminary information on certain aspects of our programs and faculty members, it provides a basis for the continued and more refined research which began the fall of 1989.

Appendix

A series of tables accompanies this report. It is divided into three main sections.

Section 1 includes institutional data across all categories tabulated.
Section 2 breaks the institutions down by enrollment size, from institutions of under 500 students through institutions of over 5000 students. A series of 7 institutional sizs were used.
Section 3 includes faculty data. It first includes faculty data across all categories tabulated, then considers male and female faculty on comparative dimensions, and concludes with totals of minority faculty.

Frequency distributions with counts, percentages, and modal scores are presented in each case. Tables are labeled at the tops of the pages.

References

Becker, Samuel L., J. Ann Selzer, and Hyeon Cheol Choi, "Theatre Programs in American Colleges and Universities," The Bulletin of the Association for Communication Administration, Issue 46, October, 1983, pp. 32-35.

Becker, Samuel L., Hyeon Cheol Choi, and J. Ann Selzer, "Theatre Faculty in the United States: Background and Task Analysis," The Bulletin of the Association for Communication Administration, Issue 49, August, 1984, pp. 21-38.

Boase, Paul H., "Speech in the Liberal Arts College," Central States Speech Journal, XVI: Feb. 1965, pp. 23-27.

Buzza, Bonnie Wilson, "Speech and Theatre Programs in Two Midwest Consortia," paper presented at the 1983 convention of the Speech Communication Association, Washington, DC.

Buzza, Bonnie Wilson, "A Second Look at Small Colleges: Definitions and Demographics," paper presented at the 1984 convention of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL.

Buzza Bonnie Wilson, "The Small College Environment," The Bulletin of the Association for Communication Administration, Issue 54, October, 1985, pp. 5-7.

Manning, Helen H., "Directions: Comparing Ourselves to our Peers and our Colleagues," paper presented at the 1982 convention of the Speech Communication Association, Louisville, KY.

Smitter, Roger, and Bonnie Wilson Buzza, "The Essential Undergraduate Curriculum in Speech Communication: A Progress Report," The Bulletin of the Association for Communication Administration, Issue 60, April, 1987, pp.63-66.

Smitter, Roger, and Joseph MacDoniels, "Approaches to the Basic Curriculum in Small College Departments," paper presented at the 1983 convention of the Speech Communication Association, Washington, DC.

Smitter, Roger, and Joseph MacDoniels, "Departmental Objectives: How Do Small College Programs Define Their Mission?" paper presented at the 1985 convention of the Central States Speech Association, Indianapolis, IN.

Waite, David H., "The Nature of Curricula and Programs of Speech in the Small College or University," paper presented at the 1985 convention of the Central States Speech Association, Indianapolis, IN.

Appendix

Section 1: institutional data across all categories

Section 2: institutional data by enrollment size
- institutions under 500 students
- 500 to 1000 students
- 1000 to 1500 students
- 1500 to 2000 students
- 2000 to 3000 students
- 3000 to 5000 students
- over 5000 students

Section 3: faculty data
- faculty data across all categories
- male and female faculty on comparative dimensions
- totals of minority faculty

Section 1: Institutional Data Across All Categories

Institutional Data Across All Categories

Size

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Under 500	25	4.817	
2	500-1000	110	21.195	
3	1000-1500	118	22.736	-Mode
4	1500-2000	114	21.965	
5	3000-5000	40	7.707	
6	Over 5000	18	3.468	
7	2000-3000	94	18.112	

Degree Program

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Four-Year	504	97.11	-Mode
2	Two-Year	15	2.89	

Type

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Private	461	88.825	-Mode
2	Public	58	11.175	

Graduate Degree

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	256	49.421	
2	Yes	262	50.579	-Mode

Graduate Degree in Speech

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	502	96.911	-Mode
2	Yes	16	3.089	

Institutional Data Across All Categories

Small College

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Small College	488	94.027	-Mode
2	Support	11	2.119	
3	Small Program	20	3.854	

of FT Faculty

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	One	10	2.513	
2	Two	44	11.055	
3	Three	59	14.824	
4	Four	127	31.91	-Mode
5	Five	66	16.583	
6	Six	73	18.342	
7	More than Six	19	4.774	

of PT Faculty

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	One	93	20.35	
2	Two	117	25.602	-Mode
3	Three	85	18.6	
4	Four	90	19.694	
5	Five	20	4.376	
6	Six	28	6.127	
7	More than Six	24	5.252	

Speech Requirement

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Yes	288	55.814	-Mode
2	No	228	44.186	

Proficiency Exam

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	431	83.527	-Mode
2	Yes	85	16.473	

Institutional Data Across All Categories

Distribution Requirement

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	263	50.969	-Mode
2	Yes	253	49.031	

EC NDT

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	428	85.089	-Mode
2	Yes	75	14.911	

EC CEDA

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	357	70.974	-Mode
2	Yes	146	29.026	

EC RT

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	409	81.312	-Mode
2	Yes	94	18.688	

Other Debate

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	450	89.463	-Mode
2	Yes	53	10.537	

EC Drama

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	262	52.087	-Mode
2	Yes	241	47.913	

Institutional Data Across All Categories

EC IE

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	288	57.256	-Mode
2	Yes	215	42.744	

Other IE

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	434	86.282	-Mode
2	Yes	69	13.718	

Section 2: Institutional Data by Enrollment Size

Institutions under 500 students
500 to 1000 students
1000 to 1500 students
1500 to 2000 students
2000 to 3000 students
3000 to 5000 students
over 5000 students

Institutions with an Enrollment of Under 500 Students

Degree Program

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Four-Year	7	100	-Mode
2	Two-Year	0	0	

Type

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Private	6	85.714	-Mode
2	Public	1	14.286	

Graduate Degree

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	7	100	-Mode
2	Yes	0	0	

Grad Degree In Speech

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	7	100	-Mode
2	Yes	0	0	

Small College

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Small College	7	100	-Mode
2	Support	0	0	
3	Small Program	0	0	

Institutions with an Enrollment of Under 500 Students

# of FT Faculty

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:
1	One	1	14.286
2	Two	2	28.571
3	Three	1	14.286
4	Four	2	28.571
5	Five	0	0
6	Six	1	14.286
7	More than Six	0	0

# of PT Faculty

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	One	2	28.571	
2	Two	3	42.857	-Mode
3	Three	1	14.286	
4	Four	0	0	
5	Five	1	14.286	
6	Six	0	0	
7	More than Six	0	0	

Speech Requirement

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Yes	5	71.429	-Mode
2	No	2	28.571	

Proficiency Exam

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	6	85.714	-Mode
2	Yes	1	14.286	

Distribution Requirement

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	5	71.429	-Mode
2	Yes	2	28.571	

Institutions with an Enrollment of Under 500 Students

EC NDT

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	5	83.333	-Mode
2	Yes	1	16.667	

EC CEDA

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	4	66.667	-Mode
2	Yes	2	33.333	

EC RT

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	6	100	-Mode
2	Yes	0	0	

Other Debate

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	6	100	-Mode
2	Yes	0	0	

EC Drama

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	1	16.667	
2	Yes	5	83.333	-Mode

Institutions with an Enrollment of Under 500 Students

EC IE

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	4	66.667	-Mode
2	Yes	2	33.333	

Other IE

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	6	100	-Mode
2	Yes	0	0	

Institutions with an Enrollment of 500-1,000 Students

Degree Program

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Four-Year	28	96.552	-Mode
2	Two-Year	1	3.448	

Type

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Private	28	96.552	-Mode
2	Public	1	3.448	

Graduate Degree

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	22	75.862	-Mode
2	Yes	7	24.138	

Grad Degree in Speech

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	28	96.552	-Mode
2	Yes	1	3.448	

Small College

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Small College	29	100	-Mode
2	Support	0	0	
3	Small Program	0	0	

Institutions with an Enrollment of 500-1,000 Students

# of FT Faculty

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:
1	One	1	3.846
2	Two	8	30.769
3	Three	5	19.231
4	Four	8	30.769
5	Five	3	11.538
6	Six	1	3.846
7	More than Six	0	0

# of PT Faculty

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	One	7	25.926	
2	Two	9	33.333	-Mode
3	Three	4	14.815	
4	Four	3	11.111	
5	Five	2	7.407	
6	Six	2	7.407	
7	More than Six	0	0	

Speech Requirement

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Yes	19	67.857	-Mode
2	No	9	32.143	

Proficiency Exam

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	25	89.286	-Mode
2	Yes	3	10.714	

Distribution Requirement

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	12	42.857	
2	Yes	16	57.143	-Mode

Institutions with an Enrollment of 500-1,000 Students

EC NDT

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	25	92.593	-Mode
2	Yes	2	7.407	

EC CEDA

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	23	85.185	-Mode
2	Yes	4	14.815	

EC RT

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	21	77.778	-Mode
2	Yes	6	22.222	

Other Debate

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	26	96.296	-Mode
2	Yes	1	3.704	

EC Drama

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	12	44.444	
2	Yes	15	55.556	-Mode

Institutions with an Enrollment of 500-1,000 Students

EC IE

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	16	59.259	-Mode
2	Yes	11	40.741	

Other IE

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	24	88.889	-Mode
2	Yes	3	11.111	

Institutions with an Enrollment of 1,000-1,500 Students

Degree Program

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Four-Year	27	93.103	-Mode
2	Two-Year	2	6.897	

Type

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Private	26	89.655	-Mode
2	Public	3	10.345	

Graduate Degree

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	20	68.966	-Mode
2	Yes	9	31.034	

Grad Degree in Speech

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	29	100	-Mode
2	Yes	0	0	

Small College

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Small College	26	89.655	-Mode
2	Support	0	0	
3	Small Program	3	10.345	

Institutions with an Enrollment of 1,000-1,500 Students

# of FT Faculty

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	One	1	3.571	
2	Two	4	14.286	
3	Three	1	3.571	
4	Four	12	42.857	-Mode
5	Five	4	14.286	
6	Six	4	14.286	
7	More than Six	2	7.143	

# of PT Faculty

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	One	7	25.926	-Mode
2	Two	6	22.222	
3	Three	4	14.815	
4	Four	5	18.519	
5	Five	0	0	
6	Six	2	7.407	
7	More than Six	3	11.111	

Speech Requirement

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Yes	17	58.621	-Mode
2	No	12	41.379	

Proficiency Exam

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	23	79.31	-Mode
2	Yes	6	20.69	

Distribution Requirement

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	16	55.172	-Mode
2	Yes	13	44.828	

Institutions with an Enrollment of 1,000-1,500 Students

EC NDT

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	24	82.759	-Mode
2	Yes	5	17.241	

EC CEDA

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	26	89.655	-Mode
2	Yes	3	10.345	

EC RT

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	23	79.31	-Mode
2	Yes	6	20.69	

Other Debate

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	26	89.655	-Mode
2	Yes	3	10.345	

EC Drama

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	11	37.931	
2	Yes	18	62.069	-Mode

Institutions with an Enrollment of 1,000-1,500 Students

EC IE

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	18	62.069	-Mode
2	Yes	11	37.931	

Other IE

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	26	89.655	-Mode
2	Yes	3	10.345	

Institutions with an Enrollment of 1,500-2,000 Students

Degree Program

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Four-Year	26	96.296	-Mode
2	Two-Year	1	3.704	

Type

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Private	25	92.593	-Mode
2	Public	2	7.407	

Graduate Degree

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	10	37.037	
2	Yes	17	62.963	-Mode

Grad Degree in Speech

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	26	96.296	-Mode
2	Yes	1	3.704	

Small College

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Small College	26	96.296	-Mode
2	Support	0	0	
3	Small Program	1	3.704	

Institutions with an Enrollment of 1,500-2,000 Students

# of FT Faculty

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	One	0	0	
2	Two	1	5	
3	Three	4	20	
4	Four	7	35	-Mode
5	Five	4	20	
6	Six	4	20	
7	More than Six	0	0	

# of PT Faculty

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	One	9	34.615	-Mode
2	Two	4	15.385	
3	Three	5	19.231	
4	Four	4	15.385	
5	Five	1	3.846	
6	Six	1	3.846	
7	More than Six	2	7.692	

Speech Requirement

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Yes	13	48.148	
2	No	14	51.852	-Mode

Proficiency Exam

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	23	85.185	-Mode
2	Yes	4	14.815	

Distribution Requirement

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	17	62.963	-Mode
2	Yes	10	37.037	

Institutions with an Enrollment of 1,500-2,000 Students

EC NDT

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	23	92	-Mode
2	Yes	2	8	

EC CEDA

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	14	56	-Mode
2	Yes	11	44	

EC RT

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	20	80	-Mode
2	Yes	5	20	

Other Debate

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	21	84	-Mode
2	Yes	4	16	

EC Drama

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	18	72	-Mode
2	Yes	7	28	

Institutions with an Enrollment of 1,500-2,000 Students

EC IE

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	13	52	-Mode
2	Yes	12	48	

Other IE

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	22	88	-Mode
2	Yes	3	12	

Institutions with an Enrollment of 2,000-3,000 Students

Degree Program

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Four-Year	22	100	-Mode
2	Two-Year	0	0	

Type

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Private	20	90.909	-Mode
2	Public	2	9.091	

Graduate Degree

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	5	22.727	
2	Yes	17	77.273	-Mode

Grad Degree in Speech

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	22	100	-Mode
2	Yes	0	0	

Small College

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Small College	21	100	-Mode
2	Support	0	0	
3	Small Program	0	0	

Institutions with an Enrollment of 2,000-3,000 Students

# of FT Faculty

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	One	0	0	
2	Two	0	0	
3	Three	2	14.286	
4	Four	3	21.429	
5	Five	4	28.571	-Mode
6	Six	3	21.429	
7	More than Six	2	14.286	

# of PT Faculty

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	One	1	5.882	
2	Two	5	29.412	
3	Three	4	23.529	
4	Four	6	35.294	-Mode
5	Five	0	0	
6	Six	1	5.882	
7	More than Six	0	0	

Speech Requirement

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Yes	9	42.857	
2	No	12	57.143	-Mode

Proficiency Exam

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	19	90.476	-Mode
2	Yes	2	9.524	

Distribution Requirement

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	9	42.857	
2	Yes	12	57.143	-Mode

Institutions with an Enrollment of 2,000-3,000 Students

EC NDT

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	14	70	-Mode
2	Yes	6	30	

EC CEDA

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:
1	No	10	50
2	Yes	10	50

EC RT

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	17	85	-Mode
2	Yes	3	15	

Other Debate

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	17	85	-Mode
2	Yes	3	15	

EC Drama

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	12	60	-Mode
2	Yes	8	40	

Institutions with an Enrollment of 2,000-3,000 Students

EC IE

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	12	60	-Mode
2	Yes	8	40	

Other IE

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	17	85	-Mode
2	Yes	3	15	

Institutions with an Enrollment of 3,000-5,000 Students

Degree Program

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Four-Year	9	100	-Mode
2	Two-Year	0	0	

Type

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Private	7	77.778	-Mode
2	Public	2	22.222	

Graduate Degree

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	0	0	
2	Yes	9	100	-Mode

Grad Degree in Speech

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	9	100	-Mode
2	Yes	0	0	

Small College

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Small College	7	77.778	-Mode
2	Support	1	11.111	
3	Small Program	1	11.111	

Institutions with an Enrollment of 3,000-5,000 Students

# of FT Faculty

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	One	0	0	
2	Two	0	0	
3	Three	0	0	
4	Four	0	0	
5	Five	1	33.333	
6	Six	2	66.667	-Mode
7	More than Six	0	0	

# of PT Faculty

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	One	0	0	
2	Two	2	33.333	-Mode
3	Three	1	16.667	
4	Four	1	16.667	
5	Five	1	16.667	
6	Six	0	0	
7	More than Six	1	16.667	

Speech Requirement

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Yes	4	44.444	
2	No	5	55.556	-Mode

Proficiency Exam

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	6	66.667	-Mode
2	Yes	3	33.333	

Distribution Requirement

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	4	44.444	
2	Yes	5	55.556	-Mode

Institutions with an Enrollment of 3,000-5,000 Students

EC NDT

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	8	88.889	-Mode
2	Yes	1	11.111	

EC CEDA

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	6	66.667	-Mode
2	Yes	3	33.333	

EC RT

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	9	100	-Mode
2	Yes	0	0	

Other Debate

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	8	88.889	-Mode
2	Yes	1	11.111	

EC Drama

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	7	77.778	-Mode
2	Yes	2	22.222	

Institutions with an Enrollment of 3,000-5,000 Students

EC IE

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	5	55.556	-Mode
2	Yes	4	44.444	

Other IE

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	8	88.889	-Mode
2	Yes	1	11.111	

Institutions with an Enrollment of Over 5,000 Students

Degree Program

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Four-Year	4	80	-Mode
2	Two-Year	1	20	

Type

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Private	1	20	
2	Public	4	80	-Mode

Graduate Degree

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	1	25	
2	Yes	3	75	-Mode

Grad Degree in Speech

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:
1	No	2	50
2	Yes	2	50

Small College

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:
1	Small College	2	40
2	Support	2	40
3	Small Program	1	20

Institutions with an Enrollment of Over 5,000 Students

# of FT Faculty

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	One	0	0	
2	Two	1	100	-Mode
3	Three	0	0	
4	Four	0	0	
5	Five	0	0	
6	Six	0	0	
7	More than Six	0	0	

# of PT Faculty

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	One	1	100	-Mode
2	Two	0	0	
3	Three	0	0	
4	Four	0	0	
5	Five	0	0	
6	Six	0	0	
7	More than Six	0	0	

Speech Requirement

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:
1	Yes	2	50
2	No	2	50

Proficiency Exam

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:
1	No	2	50
2	Yes	2	50

Distribution Requirement

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	1	25	
2	Yes	3	75	-Mode

Institutions with an Enrollment of Over 5,000 Students

EC NDT

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	3	75	-Mode
2	Yes	1	25	

EC CEDA

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	3	75	-Mode
2	Yes	1	25	

EC RT

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	3	75	-Mode
2	Yes	1	25	

Other Debate

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	4	100	-Mode
2	Yes	0	0	

EC Drama

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	1	25	
2	Yes	3	75	-Mode

Institutions with an Enrollment of Over 5,000 Students

EC IE

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	No	3	75	-Mode
2	Yes	1	25	

Other IE

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:
1	No	2	50
2	Yes	2	50

Section 3: Faculty Data

Faculty data across all categories
Male and female faculty on comparative dimensions
Totals of minority faculty

Faculty Data Across All Categories

Faculty Position

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	FT	314	81.347	-Mode
2	PT	59	15.285	
3	TP	13	3.368	

Faculty Rank

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Asc	85	23.944	
2	Ast	120	33.803	-Mode
3	Prf	79	22.254	
4	Ins	59	16.62	
5	Lct	12	3.38	

Years at Institution

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	6-10	66	18.384	
2	16+	96	26.741	
3	0-5	163	45.404	-Mode
4	11-15	34	9.471	

Security

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Ten.	175	61.404	-Mode
2	T-Trk	110	38.596	

Previous Teaching

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	TA	33	11.34	
2	FT	208	71.478	-Mode
3	PT	47	16.151	
4	TP	3	1.031	

Faculty Data Across All Categories

Highest Degree

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	PhD	178	48.634	-Mode
2	MA	117	31.967	
3	MFA	21	5.738	
4	OTHER	12	3.279	
5	ABD	25	6.831	
6	BA/BS	6	1.639	
7	MS	7	1.913	

Year Degree Recvd.

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Prior to 1970	65	25.591	
2	1971-1975	47	18.504	
3	1976-1980	50	19.685	
4	1981-1985	66	25.984	-Mode
5	1986+	26	10.236	

Attended SM

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Y	180	51.873	-Mode
2	N	167	48.127	

gender

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	M	226	64.387	-Mode
2	F	125	35.613	

Race

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	C/W/A	324	98.78	-Mode
2	Blk	3	.915	
3	H/C/S	1	.305	
4	Blc	0	0	

MALE Faculty Data Across All Categories

Faculty Position

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	FT	192	84.956	-Mode
2	PT	29	12.832	
3	TP	5	2.212	

Faculty Rank

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Asc	48	22.222	
2	Ast	71	32.87	-Mode
3	Prf	65	30.093	
4	Ins	27	12.5	
5	Lct	5	2.315	

Years at Institution

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	6-10	37	17.619	
2	16+	64	30.476	
3	0-5	90	42.857	-Mode
4	11-15	19	9.048	

Security

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Ten.	120	65.217	-Mode
2	T-Trk	64	34.783	

Previous Teaching

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	TA	21	11.798	
2	FT	132	74.157	-Mode
3	PT	25	14.045	
4	TP	0	0	

MALE Faculty Data Across All Categories

Highest Degree

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	PhD	117	53.182	-Mode
2	MA	58	26.364	
3	MFA	12	5.455	
4	OTHER	8	3.636	
5	ABD	15	6.818	
6	BA/BS	4	1.818	
7	MS	6	2.727	

Year Degree Recvd.

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Prior to 1970	43	28.667	-Mode
2	1971-1975	31	20.667	
3	1976-1980	25	16.667	
4	1981-1985	36	24	
5	1986+	15	10	

Attended SM

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Y	115	52.995	-Mode
2	N	102	47.005	

gender

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	M	226	100	-Mode
2	F	0	0	

Race

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	C/W/A	204	99.029	-Mode
2	Blk	1	.485	
3	H/C/S	1	.485	
4	Blc	0	0	

FEMALE Faculty Data Across All Categories

Faculty Position

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	FT	94	75.2	-Mode
2	PT	26	20.8	
3	TP	5	4	

Faculty Rank

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Asc	28	25.225	
2	Ast	37	33.333	-Mode
3	Prf	11	9.91	
4	Ins	29	26.126	
5	Lct	6	5.405	

Years at Institution

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	6-10	26	21.667	
2	16+	27	22.5	
3	0-5	56	46.667	-Mode
4	11-15	11	9.167	

Security

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Ten.	44	55.696	-Mode
2	T-Trk	35	44.304	

Previous Teaching

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	TA	10	10.638	
2	FT	63	67.021	-Mode
3	PT	19	20.213	
4	TP	2	2.128	

FEMALE Faculty Data Across All Categories

Highest Degree

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	PhD	45	36.885	
2	MA	55	45.082	-Mode
3	MFA	7	5.738	
4	OTHER	4	3.279	
5	ABD	8	6.557	
6	BA/BS	2	1.639	
7	MS	1	.82	

Year Degree Recvd.

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Prior to 1970	21	24.138	
2	1971-1975	11	12.644	
3	1976-1980	22	25.287	
4	1981-1985	25	28.736	-Mode
5	1986+	8	9.195	

Attended SM

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Y	58	48.333	
2	N	62	51.667	-Mode

gender

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	M	0	0	
2	F	125	100	-Mode

Race

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	C/W/A	114	98.276	-Mode
2	Blk	2	1.724	
3	H/C/S	0	0	
4	Blc	0	0	

MALE Faculty with PhD's

Faculty Position

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	FT	107	91.453	-Mode
2	PT	10	8.547	
3	TP	0	0	

Security

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Ten.	79	71.818	-Mode
2	T-Trk	31	28.182	

FEMALE Faculty with PhD's

Faculty Position

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	FT	42	93.333	-Mode
2	PT	3	6.667	
3	TP	0	0	

Security

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Ten.	21	53.846	-Mode
2	T-Trk	18	46.154	

MALE Faculty with PhD's

Faculty Rank

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Asc	27	23.894	
2	Ast	30	26.549	
3	Prf	54	47.788	-Mode
4	Ins	1	.885	
5	Lct	1	.885	

FEMALE Faculty with PhD's

Faculty Rank

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Asc	18	46.154	-Mode
2	Ast	11	28.205	
3	Prf	9	23.077	
4	Ins	1	2.564	
5	Lct	0	0	

MALE Faculty with 16+ Years at the Institution

Faculty Rank

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Asc	17	27.419	
2	Ast	2	3.226	
3	Prf	43	69.355	-Mode
4	Ins	0	0	
5	Lct	0	0	

FEMALE Faculty with 16+ Years at the Institution

Faculty Rank

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:
1	Asc	9	34.615
2	Ast	6	23.077
3	Prf	9	34.615
4	Ins	2	7.692
5	Lct	0	0

MALE Faculty with PhD's and 16+ Years at the Institution

Faculty Rank

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Asc	3	7.143	
2	Ast	0	0	
3	Prf	39	92.857	-Mode
4	Ins	0	0	
5	Lct	0	0	

FEMALE Faculty with PhD's and 16+ Years at the Institution

Faculty Rank

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Asc	3	30	
2	Ast	0	0	
3	Prf	7	70	-Mode
4	Ins	0	0	
5	Lct	0	0	

MALE Faculty with PhD's

Year Degree Recvd.

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Prior to 1970	27	31.034	-Mode
2	1971-1975	23	26.437	
3	1976-1980	11	12.644	
4	1981-1985	19	21.839	
5	1986+	7	8.046	

Years at Institution

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	6-10	20	18.018	
2	16+	43	38.739	-Mode
3	0-5	32	28.829	
4	11-15	16	14.414	

Faculty Rank

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Asc	27	23.894	
2	Ast	30	26.549	
3	Prf	54	47.788	-Mode
4	Ins	1	.885	
5	Lct	1	.885	

FEMALE Faculty with PhD's

Year Degree Recvd.

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Prior to 1970	5	15.625	
2	1971-1975	5	15.625	
3	1976-1980	8	25	
4	1981-1985	13	40.625	-Mode
5	1986+	1	3.125	

Years at Institution

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	6-10	12	27.907	
2	16+	10	23.256	
3	0-5	16	37.209	-Mode
4	11-15	5	11.628	

Faculty Rank

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Asc	18	46.154	-Mode
2	Ast	11	28.205	
3	Prf	9	23.077	
4	Ins	1	2.564	
5	Lct	0	0	

MALE PhD's with 16+ Years at the Institution

Year Degree Recvd.

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Prior to 1970	21	58.333	-Mode
2	1971-1975	11	30.556	
3	1976-1980	3	8.333	
4	1981-1985	1	2.778	
5	1986+	0	0	

Faculty Rank

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Asc	3	7.143	
2	Ast	0	0	
3	Prf	39	92.857	-Mode
4	Ins	0	0	
5	Lct	0	0	

FEMALE PhD's with 16+ Years at the Institution

Year Degree Recvd.

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Prior to 1970	3	42.857	-Mode
2	1971-1975	0	0	
3	1976-1980	2	28.571	
4	1981-1985	2	28.571	
5	1986+	0	0	

Faculty Rank

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	Asc	3	30	
2	Ast	0	0	
3	Prf	7	70	-Mode
4	Ins	0	0	
5	Lct	0	0	

Total MALE and FEMALE Faculty in Survey

gender

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	M	226	64.387	-Mode
2	F	125	35.613	

PART-TIME Faculty

gender

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	M	29	52.727	-Mode
2	F	26	47.273	

PART-TIME Faculty with PhD's

gender

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	M	10	76.923	-Mode
2	F	3	23.077	

BLACK Faculty

gender

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	M	1	33.333	
2	F	2	66.667	-Mode

HISPANIC Faculty

gender

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:	
1	M	1	100	-Mode
2	F	0	0	

Total MINORITY Faculty

gender

Bar:	Element:	Count:	Percent:
1	M	2	50
2	F	2	50